



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Hays, et al.

Atty. Dkt. No.: MET580/4-001US

Serial No.: 10/035,707

Examiner: Cheryl Maria Shechtman

Filed: December 26, 2001

Confirmation No.: 4190


Title: METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR
IMPROVED SECURITY SERVICES

Art Unit: 2163

AMENDMENT/RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED JUNE 28, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited on October 27, 2006 with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450.


Signature

Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Examiner Shechtman:

This correspondence is being filed as a full response to the Office action dated June 28, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following amendments and consideration of the appended arguments/remarks.

This Office Action response is being filed along with a request for a one month extension of time up to and including October 28, 2006 as well as a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed under 37 CFR 1.114. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the one

month extension of time fee (\$120.00) as well as the RCE fee (\$790.00) to Vinson & Elkins' Deposit Account No. 22-0365; Attn: MET580/4-1US.

RESPONSE

In her Office Action of June 28, 2006, the Examiner:

- rejected claims 36-41, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,449,661 (Frankel et al);
- rejected claims 25, 27, 29, 34, 35, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankel in view of US Patent No. 6,542,075 (Barker et al);
- rejected claims 28 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankel in view of US Patent No. 6,542,075 (Barker et al) and US Patent No. 6,173,284 (Brown);
- rejected claims 30-32 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankel in view of US Patent No. 6,542,075 (Barker et al) and US Patent No. 4,847,791 (Martin et al);
- rejected claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankel in view of Martin et al; and
- rejected claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankel in view of US Patent No. 6,542,075 (Barker et al) and US Patent No. 4,847,791 (Martin et al), and US Publication No. 2003/0115023 (Nickerson et al).